4th February 1936]·

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"On a point of order, may I know, Sir, whether the idea underlying the answer is that the question is out of order in this House?"

The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I do not see any point of order in what the hon. Member said."

Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT:—"My Hon. Friend said that the answer could be got from the Collector. I asked a question here in this House. I just want to know whether I am out of order here in asking for this information from my Hon. Friend?"

The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—"The hon. Member may not be out of order in asking for the information. The Hon. the Revenue Member is not out of order in referring him to the Collector." (Laughter.)

Protection of Wild Birds and Animals.

Cattle mortality in North Arcot due to wild animals.

* 716 *Q.*—Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state the number of cattle killed every year by wild animals in the North Arcot district during the past five years?

A.—The attention of the hon. Member is invited to the answer given to question No. 239 on the 29th October 1935, which contains information as to the number of cattle killed during 1932, 1933 and 1934. The Government have no information regarding the number of cattle killed during 1931 and 1935.

Public Service

Communities falling under the category of 'Non-Brahman Hindus' and 'Backward Communities' for purposes of Government service.

* 717 *Q.*—Rao Bahadur Subadar-Major S. A. NANJAPPA Bahadur: Will the Hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) the names of all communities in the province treated by the Government as Non-Brahman Hindus for purposes of recruitment to Government service and also their strength; and

(*b*) the names of all communities in the province treated by the Government as backward communities for purposes of recruitment to Government service as well as their strength?

A.—(*a*) The term Non-Brahman Hindus includes all communities other than (1) Brahmans, (2) Muhammadans, (3) Anglo-Indians, (4) Indian Christians, (5) Non-Asiatics, and (6) the Scheduled Classes. The total population of Non-Brahman Hindus in this Presidency is 33,011,454.

Government have no list of the various communities which constitute Non-Brahman Hindus and they do not consider that the preparation of such a list would serve any useful purpose.

(*b*) For the purposes of recruitment to Government service, backward communities as such are not recognized as a separate unit. The communal rule however recognizes the scheduled classes for representation in the public service. A list [a] of the scheduled classes is appended and their total population in this Presidency is 7,268,137.

Rao Bahadur Subadar-Major S. A. NANJAPPA Bahadur:—" May I know why the Government say here that they do not consider that the preparation of a list would serve any useful purpose? "

The Hon. Sir CHARLES SOUTER:—" I am afraid I fail to catch the hon. Member's meaning."

The Hon. the PRESIDENT:—" The hon. Member may repeat his question more audibly."

Rao Bahadur Subadar-Major S. A. NANJAPPA Bahadur:—" I want to know whose idea it is that it will not serve any useful purpose? "

The Hon. Sir CHARLES SOUTER:—" Does the hon. Member want to know the reason why the Government do not consider that the preparation of a list for Non-Brahman Hindus will serve any useful purpose? "

Rao Bahadur Subadar-Major S. A. NANJAPPA Bahadur:—" Yes, Sir."

The Hon. Sir CHARLES SOUTER:—" I must say, Sir, that the number of castes and sub-castes are so numerous that it may not be possible to make up a list."

Rao Bahadur Subadar-Major S. A. NANJAPPA Bahadur:—" May I know which is the biggest sub-caste among the Non-Brahman Hindus? "

The Hon. Sir CHARLES SOUTER:—" I want notice of the question."

Mr. M. A. MANIKKAVELU NAYAKAR:—" In the answer to clause (*b*) the Government say that for the purposes of recruitment to Government service, backward communities as such are not recognized as a separate unit. In view of the fact that the population of the backward communities is about 200 lakhs out of the 333 lakhs of Non-Brahman Hindus and also in view of the fact that the backward communities are not at all well represented in the Government service, will Government examine the question of treating the backward communities as a separate unit? "

The Hon. Sir CHARLES SOUTER:—" I must say, Sir, that I do deprecate the idea of going any further into these communal differences."

---

[a] Printed as Appendix IV on page 520 infra.

4th February 1936]

Mr. G. Sriramulu:—"May I know, Sir, whether the Government have received a representation from the Kalalis requesting that they may be treated as a community separate from the Non-Brahman Hindus?"

The Hon. Sir Charles Souter:—"Notice."

Administration of Justice

Rules regarding the sale of properties by Official Receivers.

*718 *Q.*—Mr. G. Rameswara Rao: Will the Hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Official Receivers have no rules regarding the publication and conduct of sales;

(*b*) whether the Government have received representations that some of them conduct sales without sufficient previous notice and cause hardship to owners of property and loss to creditors thereby; and

(*c*) whether the Government propose to issue rules on the subject?

A.—(*a*) The attention of the hon. Member is invited to High Court's Circular Order (F) under the heading 'Sales by Official Receivers' published at pages 226–227 of Volume I of Civil Rules of Practice (Reprint of 1930), and an extract [a] of which is annexed.

(*b*) No.

(*c*) No.

Mr. G. Rameswara Rao:—"May I ask the Hon. the Law Member to reconsider the matter in view of the fact that there is an instance of a sale having been cancelled by court, and the receiver conducting another sale the next day without any notice to the party? It is a real hardship. May I request therefore the Hon. the Law Member to reconsider the question and lay down a rule that there should be an interval?"

The Hon. Sir K. V. Reddi Nayudu:—"If any such thing had really occurred, the Official Receiver would be asked to account for it, because I find from the rules made by the High Court, that 'the first auction should always be adjourned to secure more bidders and a second auction should also be adjourned if the amount of the bid is less than half the upset price.' Then rule 5 says: 'When a sale is adjourned for more than a week there ought to be a fresh proclamation. If not a fresh proclamation, at least there ought to be fresh notices to the creditors. There ought to be something to convince one that the amount realized in the sale did not suffer diminution for want of publicity of the adjourned date.' These rules contemplate that an upset price should be fixed at any sale. But if any Official Receiver did not keep these rules in view, certainly enquiries will be made."

---

[a] Printed as Appendix V on page 521 infra.